

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 4. No. 12.

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 8, 1904.

Whole No. 168.

REORGANIZER ARGUMENT.

In Leslie's Weekly for March 31, an editorial appeared entitled "Tough on the Nebraska Worm." This editorial is reproduced in full by The Commoner, not because of its literary merit, but as a fair sample of the sort of "argument" that is used by those who are either reorganizers or agents of the men most interested in having the reorganizers obtain control of the democratic party.

Leslie's Weekly editorial is as follows:

"At last, the worm has turned! The curious product of Nebraska's mixed-up politics, who twice misled the democratic party into giving him the presidential nomination, has now been given a setback by the democracy of his own state. He has been spewed out of the mouths of the democrats in the north, east, south, and west, and his last remaining hope was that he might go to the democratic national convention at St. Louis, with his own state solidly behind him, to rule or ruin. When the Nebraska democratic state committee met recently, to fix a date for the state convention, to elect sixteen delegates to St. Louis, the wide-mouthed political spell-binder and ham-stringer, fresh from the chicken-coop of the populists, and with some of the feathers of the misappropriated chickens still clinging to his garments, undertook to fix an early day for the convention. The conservative democrats in the committee, who, like all the rest of their kind throughout the country, have grown utterly sick and tired of the pretensions of the Nebraska fakir, took things into their own hands and, after a bitter fight, carried the day by a vote of seventeen to fourteen. This marks the end of the potential influence, as harmful as potential, of the most brazen counterfeit of a statesman that the democratic party or any other party has ever produced. He dies hard for he realizes that the moment he drops out of sight his free advertising in the newspapers, which has given him a handsome fortune, will cease, and then he must go to work, like any other man, to make his money with his wits and give his jaw a rest."

What About Mr. Roosevelt?

The Chicago Tribune complains against Senator Hopkins and says that the people of Illinois have already had "a test of his quality." The Tribune specifies that Mr. Hopkins procured the nomination of Mr. L. T. Hoy as appraiser of the port of Chicago; that he obtained the removal from that position of General H. H. Thomas upon a mere pretext; that Senator Hopkins procured the appointment of another incompetent, Dr. Jamieson, as naval officer at Chicago. The Tribune denounces Senator Hopkins for his part in these appointments, reminds him that he is avowedly a civil service reformer and shows "that he has filled the most important offices in his gift with spoils politicians of the most virulent type. He must reward his followers whatever becomes of the commercial interests of the community."

Then the Tribune concludes in this way:

"The public may have some respect for an out and out spoilsman who avows himself for

what he is, but it has little or no respect for the spurious 'reformer,' who, under the pretense of promoting the interests of the community, 'steals the livery of heaven to serve the devil in.'"

But the Tribune overlooks the fact that Mr. Roosevelt made these appointments and he made them, according to the Tribune's dispatches, over the protests of Chicago people. The Tribune must not forget that he is "avowedly a civil service reformer."

Is the Tribune willing to apply the concluding sentence of its editorial to Mr. Roosevelt, who made the appointments?

Is the Tribune willing to say of Mr. Roosevelt, as it has said of Mr. Hopkins, "The public may have some respect for an out and out spoilsman, who avows himself for what he is, but it has little or no respect for the spurious 'reformer,' who, under the pretense of promoting the interests of the community, 'steals the livery of heaven to serve the devil in'?" If the Tribune is not willing that this shall be applied to the man who made these appointments, will it explain how it can place all the responsibility upon the senator who procured the appointments while relieving of all responsibility the man who made the appointments?

WHY NOT OWN THEM?

Secretary Taft has appeared before the insular committee of the house and made an argument in favor of the proposition to give the projected Philippine railroads a guarantee of 4 or 5 per cent on the investment. He thinks that a land grant would not attract capital, but that the guaranty of dividends would. Will Secretary Taft favor the plan adopted in France twenty-five years ago? There the government guaranteed a certain dividend and a certain contribution to the sinking fund, but at the end of a fifty-year term the government is to own the roads. If the government, representing the people, is to take all the risk, why not secure to the people the enjoyment of the benefits? Where is our boasted progress in the science of government if we do not protect the rights of the people as carefully today as the French government did the rights of the French people a quarter of a century ago? If railroads are demanded in the Philippines and private capital will not build the roads, it would be better for the government to build them and give the public the benefit. Far better to do this than to pledge the revenues to private corporations with no compensation in return. If the Philippine commission guarantees dividends, this guaranty will be made an excuse for continued possession to "protect vested rights." If, however, the government builds the roads for the people, they will belong to the people when the Filipinos are given independence.

Secretary Taft seems to be quite thoroughly saturated with the idea that the main purpose of government is to look after capital and to offer it such tempting advantage as to overcome its proverbial timidity. He would build society from the top, on the theory that the capitalists will take care of the people if the government will only take care of the capitalists.

PARKER NOT AVAILABLE

Mr. Cleveland's nomination is out of the question, although he is the first choice of the plutocratic element in the democratic party. Mr. Olney has removed himself by his advocacy of Mr. Cleveland's nomination, and Mr. Gorman's chances seem reduced to a minus quantity by his failure to secure the co-operation of the democratic senators in his position on the Panama question. Mr. Hill is not a possibility, but he has taken up the candidacy of Judge Parker in the hope of making himself the "power behind the throne." As some of the democrats are considering Judge Parker as a "harmony" candidate it is important that the real nature of his candidacy should be examined. He is first of all Mr. Hill's candidate, and that in itself would be sufficient to raise a suspicion in regard to his position on public questions. The Hon. David B. has a legislative record that enables us to easily ascertain his position on public questions—a record so antagonistic to the democratic party that he refused to give any open support to the ticket in 1896, and did not even disclose, until some two years after the election, how he voted. In a letter written shortly before the election he told a New York republican that he had not decided what he would do, concluding with the statement, "I am a democrat still—very still."

Mr. Hill has made himself the champion of Mr. Parker in New York, and it is not likely that he would do this without having an understanding with Mr. Parker as to his own position with the administration. It can be safely taken for granted that in case of Judge Parker's nomination and election Mr. Hill would be the controlling figure in the administration, and that would mean that those who attempted to reach the White house would have to wade through peanut shells knee deep.

Mr. Hill stands for everything bad that Mr. Cleveland stands for, and lacks the brutal frankness that has given Mr. Cleveland most of his popularity. But Mr. Hill's support, dangerous as it is, is not so detrimental to Judge Parker as the corporate support, which is gradually gathering about him. The Washington Post recently described the situation as follows:

"In the mean time, Parker stock has been having a little boom. It is now almost generally conceded by democrats here in Washington that he is the most likely candidate. Many matters have taken shape to help him, although the attitude of the New York democrats still worries the party leaders. Judge Parker—so it is learned here from men who are in close touch with the thought of the financial and business world—has, through appropriate channels, given assurances that if nominated and elected president his administration will be conservative. He will see to it that the large interests are fairly treated. This campaign of enlightenment from Judge Parker is described as progressing methodically, but with dignity. The judge's attitude on many of the questions before the public are not well known, but, none the less, business men in high places are being acquainted authentically with his views in outline.

"The criticism of the magnates against Judge Parker has been that he had not been